



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,672	04/27/2001	Jerker Bergenek	003300-777	9036

7590 01/11/2005

Benton S. Duffett, Jr.
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CHAWAN, SHEELA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,672

Applicant(s)

BERGENEK ET AL.

Examiner

Sheela C Chawan

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-14 and 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-14 and 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/29/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on June 29 2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 9 line 7-9, filed June 29, 2004, with respect to the rejection of claim(s) 1-20, under 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Abtahi et al., (US. 5,509,083).

Claims pending in the application 1, 3 -14,16-25.

Claims 2 and 15 are canceled.

Claims 21- 25 are added new claims.

Drawings

3. The Examiner has approved drawings filed on 7/8/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103[®] and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3 -14, 16 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Russo et al. (US. 6535622 B1), in view of Abtahi et al., (US.5, 509,083).

As to claim 1, Russo discloses a method of preventing false acceptance in a system for checking fingerprints which comprises a sensor, (fig 1, item 14, column 4, lines 7- 67, fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38) said method comprising:

recording a fingerprint with the sensor (fig 6, item 14 is a sensor which records the latent fingerprint); and

evaluating whether the recorded (fig 6, item 14, is a sensor which records the latent fingerprint) fingerprint originates from a latent fingerprint on the sensor or from a finger placed on the sensor on the basis of the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

Russo is silent about specifics details of sensor has an integral coordinate system.

Abtahi discloses a method and apparatus for confirming the identity of an individual presenting an identification card and also verifying that a card holder is the card owner by matching the image of the card holder's fingerprint to the unique code which has been assigned to the card owner and encoded on the card's magnetic strip is assigned to the card owner. The image of the fingerprint consists of an array of square pixels and each pixel occupies a unique location in the array. Each location can be specified by its X and Y coordinates (note, the sensor has an integral coordinate specified by its X and Y coordinates, column 5, lines 64-67, column 6, lines 1-12, column 8, lines 58-67), where X varies from side to side across the array and Y varies up and down along the array (column 6, lines 45-53, column 9, lines 24- 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Russo to include a sensor having an integral coordinate system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Russo by the teaching of Abtahi in order to provide a small data amount required to perform identification. This makes it possible to use low cost, low-density recording methods including a bar code and a magnetic strip (as suggested by Abtahi at column 5, lines 5-8).

As to claim 12 see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 21 see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claims 3 and 14, Russo discloses a method wherein the evaluation step comprises comparing the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the

Art Unit: 2625

location of a previously recorded fingerprint on the sensor (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

As to claims 4 and 17, Russo discloses a method further comprising the step of, if the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor and the location of the previously recorded fingerprint essentially correspond (column 6, lines 45- 67, column 7, lines 1-38), considering the recorded fingerprint as originating from a latent fingerprint (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

As to claims 5 and 18, Russo discloses a method wherein the previously recorded fingerprint is the immediately preceding fingerprint, which was considered as originating from a finger, placed on the sensor (column 7, lines 13-38).

As to claims 6 and 19, Russo discloses a method wherein the previously recorded fingerprint is the immediately preceding fingerprint, which was accepted (column 2, lines 30- 53, column 3, lines 52- 67).

As to claims 7 and 20, Russo discloses a method further comprising the step of storing information about the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor if the recorded fingerprint is not considered as originating from a latent fingerprint (column 6, lines 3- 67, column 7, lines 1- 12).

As to claim 8, Russo discloses a method wherein the step of comparing the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the location of a previously recorded fingerprint comprises comparing the location on the sensor of at least one feature of the recorded fingerprint with the location on the sensor of the

Art Unit: 2625

corresponding feature of the previously recorded fingerprint (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

As to claim 9, Russo discloses a method wherein the step of comparing the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the location of a previously recorded fingerprint comprises comparing the location on the sensor of a partial area (partial area is considered to be a portion of image, see column 6, lines 45- 67) of the recorded fingerprint with the location of a corresponding partial area of the previously recorded fingerprint (column 6, lines 45- 67).

As to claim 10, Russo discloses a method further comprising the step of matching at least one partial area of a reference fingerprint with the recorded fingerprint to obtain at least one matching partial area of the recorded fingerprint (partial area is considered to be a portion of image, see column 6, lines 45- 67), wherein the step of comparing the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the location of a previously recorded fingerprint comprises comparing the location on the sensor of the matching partial area with the location of the corresponding partial area of the previously recorded fingerprint (fig 6, item 68 and 70, column 7, lines 13- 38).

As to claim 11, Russo discloses a method wherein the comparison of the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the location of a previously recorded fingerprint is carried out only in the event that a matching between a reference fingerprint and the recorded fingerprint reveals that the recorded fingerprint originates from an authorized person (column 3, lines 52-67).

As to claim 13, Russo discloses a method wherein the step of detecting a latent fingerprint comprises the steps of recording (fig 6, item 14 is a sensor which records the latent fingerprint) a fingerprint by means of the sensor and (fig 1, 14), on the basis of the location (recording a portion of the image or the entire image is stored in the memory 22 based on centrally located portion of the image, column 6, lines 40- 53) of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor (column 6, lines 40-53), evaluating whether the recorded fingerprint originates from a latent fingerprint on the sensor or from a finger placed on the sensor (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

As to claim 16, Russo discloses a storage medium for digital information (fig 1, item 22, memory where information is stored), which medium is readable for a computer system (fig 1, item 12, a computer systems) the storage medium containing a computer program for preventing false acceptance of fingerprints, characterized in that said program implements (column 1, lines 10-13, column 3, lines 10- 67).

As to claim 22 and 25, Russo discloses a method wherein the subsequent fingerprint corresponds to that of a finger in contact with the sensor at the time the recorded fingerprint is recorded by the sensor (column3, lines 56-66).

As to claim 23, claim 23 recites similar limitation as claim 1 above and similarly analyzed except for the step of a processing unit coupled to the sensor as taught by Russo (fig 1, column 3, lines 10-67).

As to claim 24, Russo discloses a system wherein the processing unit is configured to compare the location of the recorded fingerprint on the sensor with the

Art Unit: 2625

location of a previously recorded fingerprint on the sensor (fig 6, column 6, line 16 to column 7, lines 1-38).

Other prior art cited

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Blonder (US. 4,414,684) discloses method and apparatus for performing a comparison of given patterns, in particular fingerprints.

Shpuntov et al.,(US.5,917,928) discloses system and method for automatically verifying identify of a subject.

Driscoll, Jr. et al., (US. 5,067,162) discloses a method and apparatus for verifying identity using image correlation.

Indeck et al., (US.5,428,683) discloses method and apparatus for fingerprinting and authenticating magnetic media.


Art Unit: 2625

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela C Chawan whose telephone number is 703-305-4876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8 - 6.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on 703-308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sheela Chawan
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2625
Jan 3, 2005